REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Claims 1-24 were previously pending.

Claims 11, 14, and 20 are canceled

Claims 1, 10, 13, 16-17 are currently amended.

Claims 1-10, 12-13, 15-19, and 21-24 are currently pending.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-8, 10-18, 20, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kimoto et al. (USPN 6,115,611).

The Kimoto reference

Kimoto describes a mobile communicating system, in which a mobile terminal has a position-information-detecting unit for transmitting position information to an information center. The information center has an accumulating unit for accumulating information/services from many of the mobile terminals.

Each mobile terminal transmits position information of its own to the information center so as to utilize information or a service relating to the position information accumulated in the accumulating unit in the information center. In this system, each of the mobile terminals transmits information or a service relating to the position information as up-load data to the information center through an up-load data transmitting unit, thereby accumulating and updating on occasion information or services in the information center.

Each of the mobile terminals provides information or a service relating to position information as up-load data to the information center, thereby accumulating and updating on occasion information or services in the information center in a learning fashion, so that the system has more information to share if the system is operated more frequently (col. 16, line 23 – col. 17, line 11).

Claim 1

Applicant's claim 1, as amended, defines a computer-readable storage medium containing instructions that are executable by a computer to perform steps, including:

- sending an HTTP request that includes geographical coordinates of a mobile client;

- receiving from a server, geographically-dependent content that is customized to the geographical coordinates in the HTTP request, the geographically-dependent content including a valid zone indicator indicating an area in which the geographically-dependent content is valid, wherein the area is customized in size according to the geographically-dependent content;

- comparing a current location of the mobile client to the valid zone indicator;

- determining that the geographically-dependent content is no longer valid based on the comparing; and

- sending a new HTTP request that includes new geographical coordinates of the mobile client.

The Kimoto reference does not show or disclose each element of claim 1. For example, the Kimoto reference does not show or disclose the element of "a valid zone indicator indicating an area in which the geographically-dependent content is valid." The Kimoto reference also does not show the element of "wherein the area is customized in size according to the geographically-dependent content."

The "valid zone indicator" of Applicant's claim 1 may take a form such as:

GPSLocation: 46.21 N, 85.30 W, GPSValidRadius: 1.6 km (Applicant's specification, page 12, line 7)

and provides a geographical expiration of content provided to a mobile device's *web browser* (such as advertisements of local establishments), the geographical expiration analogous to the well-known temporal expiration of advertisements due to sale prices ending.

The radius of the valid zone, that is, the "valid zone specification" is customized according to the type of information being provided from a server to the mobile device. Thus, if the mobile user queries for a nearest McDonald's restaurant and there is a McDonald's on every block in Manhattan, then the customized radius is likely to be the size of half a block.

Upon leaving the area of information validity, the user's mobile device automatically resubmits its request to obtain new information appropriate for the new user's location. That is, when the user's web browser leaves the valid zone, the browser invalidates the content. More specifically, it resubmits the HTTP request that generated the content to obtain new content that is appropriate for the new location of the browser. (Applicant's specification, page 11, lines 20-25).

The Kimoto reference does not show or disclose each element of claim 1, and hence Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection be removed.

Claims 10, 13, 16, and 17

Claims 10, 13, 16, and 17, as amended, include the same elements as claim 1 discussed above. Thus, the Kimoto reference does not show or disclose each element of claims 10, 13, 16, and 17, and hence Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejections be removed.

Claims 2-8, 11-12, 14-15, 18, 20, and 22

Claims 2-8, 11-12, 14-15, 18, 20, and 22 depend from their respective base claims and contain all the language of their respective base claims. Since the respective base claims are allowable, these dependent claims are allowable too.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 9 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimoto in view of Izawa (USPN 5,471,205).

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimoto in view of Schreder (USPN 5,504,482).

Claims 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimoto in view of DeLorme (USPN 5,848,373).

Each of the above dependent claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) includes all the language of one of the respective base claims. The base claims contain the elements:

- server returns a valid zone specification in conjunction with returned geographically-dependent content, the *valid zone specification* indicating a

geographical zone within which the returned geographically-dependent content is considered valid (emphasis added),

- the geographical *zone customized in size according to the geographically-dependent content* (emphasis added).

Kimoto and Izawa, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above elements.

Kimoto and Schreder, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above elements.

Kimoto and DeLorme, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above elements.

Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection be removed from claims 9, 21, 19, 23, and 24.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-10, 12-13, 15-19, and 21-24 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: ___January 7, 2008___   By: ___/Mark Farrell/___
                                          LEE & HAYES, pllc
                                          Mark C. Farrell
                                          Reg. No. 45,988
                                          (509) 324-9256 ext 243